



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,736	09/30/2004	Lee George Laborczfalvi	2006579-0242	5735
69665 7590 08/19/2009 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER ANYA, CHARLES E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,736

Applicant(s)

LABORCZFALVI ET AL.

Examiner

CHARLES E. ANYA

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are pending this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0050084 A1 to Atm in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,889,249 B2 issued to Miloushev et al.**

3. As to claim 1, Atm teaches a method for presenting an aggregate view of native resources, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) enumerating a plurality of system-scoped native resources provided by a system scope (figure 4, "...a dynamic partition data store..." page 1 paragraph 0014-0016, page 2 paragraph 0017, Dynamic Partition Data Store 120 page 2 paragraph 0031);

(b) enumerating a plurality of application-scoped native resources provided by an application isolation scope, some of the plurality of application-scoped resources corresponding to some of the plurality of system-scoped resources (figure 4, "...system

registry..." page 1 paragraph 0014, "...dynamic partition data store...information associated with...system registry..." page 1 paragraph 0016);

(c) determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, the existence of a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources ("...the dynamic partition data store can be a remapping table in the system can be dynamically manipulated with the interception component intercepting system service call(s)..." page 2 paragraph 0017, "...make a native call using the modified set of parameters..." page 2 paragraph 0019, page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0043, page 5 paragraph 0060) and

d) including the corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources ("...the dynamic partition data store can be a remapping table in the system can be dynamically manipulated with the interception component intercepting system service call(s)..." page 2 paragraph 0017, "...make a native call using the modified set of parameters..." page 2 paragraph 0019, page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0043, page 5 paragraph 0060).

Atm is silent with reference to (d) determining an aggregate view of native resources.

Miloushev teaches determining an aggregate view of native resources ("...aggregate the results..." Col. 22 Ln. 57 – 67, figure 19 Col. 33 Ln. 35 – 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Atm with the teaching of Miloushev because the teaching of Miloushev would improve the system of Atm by providing a technique for aggregating data files among multiple servers and thus allowing for concurrent

environment that enables parallel operation and thus high availability (Miloushev Col. 21 Ln. 32 – 36).

4. As to claim 2, Atm teaches the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) comprises determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources does not exist (Steps 420/440 page 5 paragraphs 0060/0063-0064).

5. As to claim 3, Miloushev teaches the method of claim 2 wherein step (d) comprises including the one of the plurality of system-scoped resources in an aggregate view of native resources (“...aggregate the results...” Col. 22 Ln. 57 – 67, figure 19 Col. 33 Ln. 35 – 55).

6. As to claim 4. Atm teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

(e) enumerating a plurality of user-scoped native resources provided by a user isolation scope, some of the plurality of user-scoped resources corresponding to some of the plurality of system-scoped resources (“...customized view(s) of the system registry to client(s) ...Customization can be based...on user...” page 1 paragraph 0014, “...a different view of the registry based on the logged on user...” page 2 paragraph 0032, “...dynamic partition data store 120 can depend upon user defined re-mapping information...” page 3 paragraph 0045);

(f) determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, the existence of a corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources (“...the dynamic partition data store can be a remapping table in the system can be dynamically manipulated with the interception component intercepting system service call(s)...” page 2 paragraph 0017, “...make a native call using the modified set of parameters...” page 2 paragraph 0019, page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0043, page 5 paragraph 0060); and

(g) including the corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources (“...the dynamic partition data store can be a remapping table in the system can be dynamically manipulated with the interception component intercepting system service call(s)...” page 2 paragraph 0017, “...make a native call using the modified set of parameters...” page 2 paragraph 0019, page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0043, page 5 paragraph 0060).

Miloushev teaches determining an aggregate view of native resources (“...aggregate the results...” Col. 22 Ln. 57 – 67, figure 19 Col. 33 Ln. 35 – 55).

7. As to claim 5, Atn teaches the method of claim 4 wherein step (f) comprises determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources does not exist (Steps 420/440 page 5 paragraphs 0060/0063-0064).

8. As to claim 6, Miloushev teaches the method of claim 5 wherein step (g) comprises including the one of the plurality of system-scoped resources in an aggregate

view of system-scoped resources (“...aggregate the results...” Col. 22 Ln. 57 – 67, figure 19 Col. 33 Ln. 35 – 55).

9. As to claim 7, Atm teaches the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) comprises determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources indicates the resource is deleted (Steps 420/440 page 5 paragraphs 0060/0063-0064).

10. As to claim 8, Atm teaches the method of claim 7 wherein step (d) comprises removing the system-scoped resource from the view of system-scoped resources (Step 530 page 5 paragraph 0065).

11. As to claim 9, Atm teaches the method of claim 4 wherein step (f) comprises determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources indicates the resource is deleted (Steps 420/440 page 5 paragraphs 0060/0063-0064).

12. As to claim 10, Atm teaches the method of claim 9 wherein step (g) comprises removing the system-scoped resource from the view of system-scoped resources (Step 530 page 5 paragraph 0065).

13. As to claim 11, Atm teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of intercepting, by one of a file system driver, a mini-driver, a user mode hooking mechanism, and a kernel mode hooking mechanism, a request to enumerate a file system comprising system-scoped resources (Interception Component 110 page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0042/0043).

14. As to claim 12, Atm teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of intercepting a request to enumerate a plurality of registry entries (Interception Component 110 page 3 paragraphs 0038/0039/0042/0043).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES E. ANYA whose telephone number is (571)272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles E Anya/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194